

## **Трудности когнитивной лингвистики в междисциплинарной парадигме**

**Л.С. Абросимова**

Южный федеральный университет  
lara.abrossimova@mail.ru

**Аннотация.** Данная статья описывает те трудности, с которыми сталкивается когнитивная лингвистика на современном этапе развития науки, когда на первый план выступают междисциплинарные исследования. Некоторые принципы междисциплинарного сотрудничества все еще игнорируются и отвергаются рядом ученых, что приводит к исключительно формализованным «схематическим» подходам, оторванным от культурно-исторического опыта. На примере производных слов автор доказывает необходимость учета телесных и культурно-исторических практик в лингвокогнитивном и словообразовательном моделировании, подтверждая избирательность человеческого мышления.

**Ключевые слова:** междисциплинарная парадигма, когнитивная лингвистика, словообразование, производное слово, моделирование, когнитивные модели

## **Cognitive Linguistics Challenges In Multidisciplinary Paradigm**

**L.S. Abrosimova**

Southern Federal University  
lara.abrosimova@mail.ru

**Abstract.** The work describes contradictions and difficulties lying before cognitive linguistics at the stage of increasing interest to interdisciplinary research. Some principles of interdisciplinary cooperation are still neglected and disapproved of by a number of scientists. This leads to thriving of formal models in cognitive linguistics, lacking in any connection to cultural and historical experience. By the examples of derived words the author points out the necessity to take into account the physical factor, cultural and historical practices in derivational relations and consider them as the bases for cognitive language modeling, again proving the selectivity of human mind.

**Keywords:** interdisciplinary paradigm, cognitive linguistics, word-formation, a derivative, modeling, cognitive models

The development of cognitive linguistics at the end of last century was called “the time of revolt and overturn” (Parshin 1996: 30-31). E. S. Kubryakova (2001: 4) mentions that the cognitive paradigm faces the necessity to lay its road “with some resistance” and has to go through “critical attacks”, made by representatives of more conventional points of view. The antagonistic character of relations between conventional and cognitive approaches to Linguistic studies is observed in a number of statements made by scientists (see Demiankov 1994). Perhaps such arguments are quite natural for the stage of the new paradigm’s development, which may last for many years, and they prove great interest to the new knowledge and possibilities, which are sure to appear within the framework of new research prospects.

It is no great surprise that cognitive linguistics, as well as any other “young” science, faces the problems of formation and cooperation with other sciences, which are now found in the process of

forming the subject and methodological field of a science. And it is the attempts to solve these problems which lead to the enrichment of science with new knowledge and, hence, turn out to be an endless process of developing scientific thoughts.

At modern stage cognitive approaches to studying linguistic phenomena embrace only a humble part of human cognitive processes, connected with language development and learning. Numerous attempts to formalize the humanities and establish “the technique” for developing and exploring language and culture create a danger for the cognitive approach to become a material and technical base of science once again.

One of the problems with linguists who study cognition is the superfluity of terminology, which complicates understanding and makes the processes of cognitive research, which are far from being easy, even more difficult. Such terms as *frames*, *subframes*, *gestalts*, *mental models*, *slots or terminal cells*, *scripts*, *scenarios*, *profiles*, *quanta*, *knots*, *constructs* (taken by analogy from physiology, psychology, programming, physics, mechanics and building and often having no definitions of their own in cognitive linguistics) are used metaphorically together with already conventional in lexicology *models*, *links*, *paradigms*, *families of words*, *types* etc. Young cognitologists experience difficulties and frustration while trying to puzzle out this superabundance of terms, in many of which it is hard to trace any semantic definiteness.

With such formalistic approach human as the creator of language is almost pushed aside to the periphery, while simplified (although extremely difficult for understanding) universal mentalistic (ideal) structures of formal nature appear on the foreground. Isn't it a clumsy effort of many to make one's significant contribution to the development of a new science, which would be responsible for all of this? Isn't it an allurements to turn once again to material and structural description and narrow down all the aspects of human vital activities to formulae, schemes and formants of its description? Not at all. All the above-mentioned terms are the result of the immaturity of cognitive science.

Another drawback, found in some researches on cognitive linguistics, is an occasionally active researchers' rejection of interdisciplinary cooperation principles. Some cognitology linguists prefer working in isolated linguistic sphere, as they find it quite sufficient for their aims. The understanding of cognitive linguistics as purely based on the ability to “pack” cognitive structures into some artificially assigned models, devoid of any connection to cultural and historical experience.

What stands behind such active rejection of apparent prospects of interdisciplinary cooperation? The answer seems quite obvious to us. Interdisciplinarity requires broad panoramic knowledge in such disciplines as Cognitive Psychology, Philosophy and Cognitive Cultural Studies. We are certain that interdisciplinary forms of cooperation, when one and the same subject is explored by a team of representatives of different disciplines (see Abrosimova, Bogdanova, 2011; Porozhdenie nauchnogo znaniya, 2012) and not just a single domain specialist, will encourage overriding of the above mentioned drawbacks and faster establishment of Cognitive Linguistics. In our opinion, cognitive linguistics in its development is “destined” to unite with other sciences. The empirical character of language phenomena cannot but take into account their biological, psychological, socio-cultural and functional-discursive peculiarities, which inevitably presents cognitive research as the panorama of interdisciplinary relations. At the beginning of XXI century interdisciplinarity and multiparadigmality appear to be the necessary conditions for understanding and describing the architectonics of the science of language, which is pluralistic, multilevel, interdisciplinary and proceeding from the principal variability of existence.

And finally the attempts to create the cognitive linguistic science as a strict one like other exact sciences can be considered the third block of problems, connected to the two previous ones. Despite objectivity, universalism and strictness of scientific knowledge, in the science of language as a form of real human activity one must take into account the fact that man is the creation and creator of culture, a creature both rational and irrational. We are at one with A.V. Kravchenko, who states that linguistic research, disregarding the peculiarities of “(a) human perception and emotional state, (b) empirical experience, gained during the lifetime and affecting perception and

interpretation, and (c) the character of (physical, social and linguistic) environment, in which life takes its course, and which predetermines the quality of gained experience to a significant degree, will keep accumulating noncontiguous knowledge without drawing us closer to synthetism in understanding the phenomenon of life and cognition” (Kravchenko 2004: 49).

It is important to mention that when we try to describe phenomena of the objective physical world, it is always possible to find and use more or less accurate “measuring tools” for a description of such kind, but when we deal with keen human activity, such strict patterns are out of the question. Therefore it is not quite possible to speak about humanitarian knowledge (linguistics in particular) as a strict science like mathematics. Consequently, we are to be ready for including different kinds of assumptions, personal interpretations, hypothetical suppositions etc. in the process of research, which is determined by the character of humanitarian empirism, marked by agility, variability, axiologiness and contextuality (instead of classical methodological spanning as a universal character building means).

Developers of the new linguistic school, which views different processes in terms of “mental activity” (receiving, processing, storing and reproducing information) and “human factor” should, in our opinion, take into account the following conditions:

- cognitive structures form under the influence of gained life experience (experientialism);
- mentality, understood in a broad sense, includes also pre-reflective levels (cultural archetypes, intuitive insights, emotional sufferings, socio-psychological and national stereotypes etc.);
- embodiment is considered an important component and even a source of cognitive processes, as G. Lakoff suggests in his ideas of inherently embodied mind (Lakoff, 1999).

These conditions suggest interdisciplinarity, the necessity of cultural-historical excursions and involving the “human factor” in research programs, which suggests the presence of subjective components and axiologiness, largely surpassing capabilities of strict modeling.

Let us turn to the results of the semantic derivation analysis of the somatism *arm*, relying on the foregoing premises. This somatism and its profuse derivational potential prove the importance of approaching ontological (primary existential) bases of derivational processes, as *arm* is an important part of the body, the person’s first guide in getting to know the world around.

From ancient times the arm serves as the main means of communication between a person and objects of reality, surrounding them, *an instrument* for interaction with things, as well as *means* of protection. All of this is reflected both verbally and non-verbally in the body language. Folded arms are a sign of hostility and protection; helplessly hanging hands are a symbol of lack of confidence and raised hands denote the feeling of victory and triumph. Formal relations suggest shaking hands, informal – hugging and patting on the shoulder. All these displays preserve people’s emotions and etiquette symbols.

Language also reflects the symbolic meaning of the arm as the marker of connection with another person, intimacy or safety. The expressions *to be arm-in-arm*, *offer an arm* and *with open arms* suggest trust and frankness. Derived units also extrapolate cultural denotata: *to arm* means to support somebody by their arms; *arm-lock* is gripping somebody’s arms as a means of self-protection; *arm-twisting* is applying pressure (in order to persuade, acquire support; often in politics) etc. All these language expressions come from our physical experience of interacting with environment.

The *simplest* form of meaning (the cognitive model) of the word *arm* can be formed due to **the elements of action**: the means (the instrument) and conditions (circumstances). Apparently, the main or basic meaning comes from actions, connected to physical impact: restricting, allowing or intensifying actions with the arm. The noun *arm* is of Germanic origin and appears in the English language in the Old English Period, denoting a part of the body from shoulder to hand. A little later in the Old English Period the figurative meaning of the noun appears: *might*, *strength*, *power*; *reliance*, *support*.

Another form of meanings comes from the **structure of the body**, a part of which *the arm* is. It becomes an important symbol, which provides a metaphoric shift of meaning to an element of

some other structure. At the end of the Middle English the word *arm* starts to be applied to the forelimb of an animal. At the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century *the arm* also begins to denote a sleeve of a piece of clothing. At the same time the meanings develop, which are related to the metaphorical shift of physical characteristics of the arm as a part of the body (it is long and thin) to other objects of the world around: in the Old English language the meaning of *the arm* as *a narrow strip of water or land projecting from a larger body* is fixed. Later in the Middle English a shift to the meanings *arms of a tree, arms of a road* takes place.

*The third* possible form of meanings comes from **functional qualities** of the arm and conditions of their realization, for example its numerous kinesthetic functions. With the invention of technical instruments and machines man uses the noun *arm* in the meaning of “a lever; a handle, a grip; a wheel spoke”, shifting his perceptions of physical and functional load of the body part to other objects. With the development of technical inventions the word *arm* acquires specialized meanings in building, car industry, astronomy etc.

The semantic derivation of *the arm* provides appearance of new meanings, connected to the prototypical perceptions of the *form* and *function* of the arm. Hence, the development of the prototypical meaning in the semantic structure of the word *arm* went in the direction “part of the body → thing, object”.

The semantic derivation analysis of the word *arm* according to the diachronic approach demonstrates the gradual shift of semantic stresses from sensually detectable ones to more abstract and systematic content, the understanding of which requires special logical procedures.

Cognitive Linguistics is of great heuristic potential, and there is a lot of productive research and scientific schools (the works by the representatives of the scientific school formed by E.S. Kubryakova, Tambov scientific school under professor N.N. Boldyrev, the Russian Association of Cognitology linguists etc.). There is no doubt of the future belonging to Cognitive Linguistics. In due course it will overcome the growing pains and natural arrangement of conceptual framework and methodology will take place.

## References

Abrosimova L.S., Bogdanova M.A. 2011. Chelovek telesnyj i slovesnyj. Rostov n/D: IPO PI JuFU. – 184 s.

Abrosimova L.S. 2013. Word-Formation in The Context Of Multi-Disciplinary Cognitive Paradigm. International Journal of Cognitive Research in science, engineering and education. Vol. 1, No.1, 2013.

Demiankov V.Z. 1994. Kognitivnaja lingvistika kak raznovidnost' interpretirujushhego podhoda // Voprosy jazykoznanija. 1994. № 4. – P. 17-33.

Kravchenko A.V. 2004. Kognitivnaja lingvistika segodnja: integracionnye processy i problema metoda // Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki. № 1. – P. 37-52.

Kubryakova E.S. 2001. O kognitivnoj lingvistike i semantike termina «kognitivnyj» // Vestnik Voronezhskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Serija: Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaja kommunikacija. Voronezh, S. – P. 4-10.

Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. 1999. Philosophy in the flesh. The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought [Text] / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – New York: Basic Books.

Parshin P.B. 1996. Teoreticheskie perevoroty i metodologicheskij mjatezh v lingvistike XX veka // Voprosy jazykoznanija. №2. – P. 19-42.

Porozhdenie nauchnogo znanija: kollektivnaja monografija. 2012 / Pod red. S.I. Masalovoj – Rostov n/D: IPO PI JuFU. 276 s.

## Литература

*Абросимова Л.С., Богданова М.А. 2011. Человек телесный и словесный. Ростов н/Д: ИПО ПИ ЮФУ. – 184 с.*

*Демьянков В.З. 1994. Когнитивная лингвистика как разновидность интерпретирующего подхода // Вопросы языкознания. 1994. № 4, 17-33.*

*Кравченко А.В. 2004. Когнитивная лингвистика сегодня: интеграционные процессы и проблема метода // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. № 1, 37-52.*

*Кубрякова Е.С. 2001. О когнитивной лингвистике и семантике термина «когнитивный» // Вестник Воронежского государственного университета. Серия: Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. Воронеж, С. 4-10.*

*Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. 1999. Philosophy in the flesh. The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought [Text] / G. Lakoff, M. Johnson. – New York: Basic Books.*

*Паришин П.Б. 1996. Теоретические перевороты и методологический мятеж в лингвистике XX века // Вопросы языкознания. №2, 19-42.*

*Порождение научного знания: коллективная монография. 2012 / Под ред. С.И. Масаловой – Ростов н/Д: ИПО ПИ ЮФУ. 276 с.*

## Сведения об авторе:

Абросимова Лариса Сергеевна,  
доктор филологических наук, доцент,  
профессор кафедры теории и практики английского языка Института филологии,  
журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации Южного федерального университета, г.  
Ростов-на-Дону  
lara.abrossimova@mail.ru